



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/553,068	04/20/2000	Christopher Phillips	112076-138336	5825
25943 7590 08/04/2008 SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, JAGDISH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3693				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/553,068

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

JAGDISH N. PATEL

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/30/08.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, 13-15, 18-20, 22-25, 43-45, 48, 50-52 and 61-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, 13-15, 18-20, 22-25, 43-45, 48, 50-52 and 61-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed 4/30/08.

Response to Amendment

2. Claims 1, 7-8, 43 and 45 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-15, 18-20, 22-25, 43-45, 48, 50-52, and 61-71 are pending. Claims 1, 7-8, 43, and 65 have been amended, and claims 70-71 have been added.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments with respect to claim rejection under 35 USC 101 have been considered and have been found persuasive and said rejection of claims under 35 USC 101 have been withdrawn.

However, the applicants' arguments in regards to 35 USC 112 (second) rejection, concerning lack of various communication links and lines of communication are not persuasive. The amended claim recites a step of determining by the billing service whether use of the (first and second) billing data is valid. Furthermore, the amended claim recites that the determination includes whether the billing data provided to the user was used with the respective website.

However, without the billing service having any basis for determining the validity of the usage of the billing data this process can not be accomplished. The amended claim is therefore lacking certain process steps that facilitate the verification as stated. The applicants suggest that

Art Unit: 3693

interaction of the user to whom and the billing service is either well understood in the art and are further described in the specification and that such lack of specific protocols and identified lines of communication do not render the claims indefinite.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants' assertions and points out that the missing features in the claims can not be read in view of the specification.

Although a claim should be interpreted in light of the specification disclosure, it is generally considered improper to read limitations contained in the specification into the claims. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969) and *In re Winkhaus*, 527 F.2d 637, 188 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1975), which discuss the premise that one cannot rely on the specification to impart limitations to the claim that are not recited in the claim.

Therefore, all pending claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-15, 18-20, 22-25, 43-45, 48, 50-52, and 61-71 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are:

(i) registration of the user with the billing service, the user providing information regarding the requested billing data (user identification, website identification)

(ii) generation of the user specific and website specific billing data by the billing service based on the information received from the requesting user and the billing data received from the billing data issuing source(s).

Claim 1 fails to show that the computing device(s) of the billing service can determine validity of usage of the billing data as stated. This is because such verification requires the billing service to maintain specific records of the billing data it issues to the user including the

website for which the first and the second billing data is issued. Since the billing data obtained from the issuing sources do not contain any limitations regarding the usage of the respective billing data, it is assumed that this functionality is performed by the billing service that distributes the billing data. Thus, to facilitate the newly added determining step, the billing data provided to the user must be distinguished from that obtained by the billing service from the issuing sources in terms of associated restrictions of their usage such as the authorized user and the website where the billing data is usable.

The examiner also points out that the term "use of the billing data being valid" is to be interpreted as attempt by any person to use the billing data at any website and in this context the billing service must have sufficient data available as reference points to accomplish the validity process.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAGDISH PATEL whose telephone number is (571) 272-6748. The examiner can normally be reached on **800AM-630PM Mon-Tue and Thu.**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **KRAMER JAMES A** can be reached on **(571)272-6783**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/JAGDISH N PATEL/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693